



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/660,433	09/07/2000	Kip Van Steenburg	7175/65430	6205

7590

05/21/2002

Richard D. Conard
Barnes & Thornburg
1313 Merchants Bank Building
11 S Meridan Street
Indianapolis, IN 46204

EXAMINER

TRETTEL, MICHAEL

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3673

DATE MAILED: 05/21/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

SK

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/660,433	Applicant(s) STEENBURG, KIP VAN	
	Examiner Michael Trettel	Art Unit 3673	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 February 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-100 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-100 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 3673

DETAILED ACTION***Reissue Applications***

The reissue oath/declaration filed with this application is defective (see 37 CFR 1.175 and MPEP § 1414) because of the following:

Claims 14 to 100 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 251 as being an improper recapture of broadened claimed subject matter surrendered in the application for the patent upon which the present reissue is based. See *Hester Industries, Inc. v. Stein, Inc.*, 142 F.3d 1472, 46 USPQ2d 1641 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Clement*, 131 F.3d 1464, 45 USPQ2d 1161 (Fed. Cir. 1997); *Ball Corp. v. United States*, 729 F.2d 1429, 1436, 221 USPQ 289, 295 (Fed. Cir. 1984). A broadening aspect is present in the reissue which was not present in the application for patent. The record of the application for the patent shows that the broadening aspect (in the reissue) relates to subject matter that applicant previously surrendered during the prosecution of the application. Accordingly, the narrow scope of the claims in the patent was not an error within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 251, and the broader scope surrendered in the application for the patent cannot be recaptured by the filing of the present reissue application.

The applicant is attempting to claim the supporting device without reference to a longitudinal axis and a clamping device having an axis transverse to the longitudinal axis. The applicant is also attempting to drop out any reference to a clamping device that can simultaneously clamp and release the supporting device relative to the clamping device about the first and second (longitudinal and transverse) axes. These limitations were expressly added during the prosecution of the 08/813708 application in order to define over the subject matter

Art Unit: 3673

disclosed in the Klevstad patent. These inclusion of these limitations in the original claims 1 to 13 were also relied upon by the applicant as part of the arguments used to secure an allowance over the Klevstad patent. Reference should be made to the arguments and statements made on pages 3 to 5 of the amendment of February 17, 1998 (Paper No. 4) of the 08/813,708 application. Taking as an example claim 1 as amended in the 08/813,708 application, and the independent claims 14, 24, 48, 72, 81, and 91 the differences are as follows:

The claims drops out the specific reference to the abduction dimension and lithotomy dimension made by amendment in lines 2 and 3 of old claim 1:

The claims drop out the limitation of "having a longitudinal axis" in line 4 of old claim 1 which had been added by amendment:

The claims drop out the limitation "transverse to said longitudinal axis" added by amendment to line 8 of claim 1, and drops out any reference to the mounting device having a first axis:

The claims drop out "simultaneously" added by amendment to line 9 of claim 1:

The claims drops out the limitation added by amendment concerning to the support device being fixed in the clamping device against rotation about said longitudinal axis added to lines 11 to 13 of old claim 1, and now states that the support device is clamped against movement about the second plurality of axes;

The claims drop out the limitations added by amendment to lines 14 and 15 of claim 1 stating that the actuator device actuates the clamping device for simultaneously clamping the support device and mounting device, and now states that the clamping device can selectively clamp and release the support device relative to the mounting device.

The independent claims therefore removes or broadens almost all the limitations added to old claim 1 during the prosecution in order to define over the Klevstad reference, these limitations were referred to and relied upon extensively in the applicant's arguments as defining over the Klevstad patent. Since these limitations were added in order to secure an allowance, any attempt to now drop them out altogether is an attempt at recapture. This is supported by the applicant's declaration, in which it is stated clearly that the mistake sought for correction was limiting claim 1 to a supporting device with a longitudinal axis and the clamping device having an axis transverse to the longitudinal axis. These limitations were added during the prosecution of claim 1 in the original application, and were not present in the claims as originally filed.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on February 28, 2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant has argued that the present Reissue Application and the claims therein are not an attempt at recapture, noting that while some limitations added during the parent application's prosecution have been deleted from the claims, other non-amended limitations have been deleted and yet other limitations added in order to make the claims both broader in some respects and narrower in other respects. This avoids the central issue present in this application, which is the applicant's deletion of the specific amendments added to the independent claim 1 in order to secure an allowance of the claims pending in the parent application. This is a textbook example of recapture, in support of his position the examiner will direct the attention of the Applicant to Pannu v. Storz Instruments Inc., 59 USPQ2D 1597 (CAFC 2001). The facts of the Pannu decision are quite applicable to the present application,

Art Unit: 3673

since in the Pannu decision an attempt was made to remove limitations specifically added to the independent claims in order to secure an allowance. Removing claim limitations that were added by amendment is not an "error" that can be remedied by reissue.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Trettel whose telephone number is 703-308-0416. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday, or Friday from 7.30 am to 5.00 pm.

Art Unit: 3673

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Shackelford, can be reached on (703) 308-2978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-308-3687.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1020.


Michael Trettel
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3673